



California Architects

a publication of the california architects board

public protection through examination, licensure and regulation

Implementing IDP: A National Perspective

By Robert Rosenfeld, Director of Council Record Services, NCARB

While most of California's practicing architects agree with the concept of a structured internship program, many have concerns about the implementation of the Intern Development Program (IDP) in the state. California is a big state with unique issues and practice environments. An undertaking of this magnitude will cause waves — that is a given. By laying the groundwork early, and taking advantage of lessons other states have already learned, all of us hope to make the transition as smooth as possible.

Since 1978, I have worked with a number of states as they made the move to IDP. In this article, I would like to share some of the lessons learned and successful strategies undertaken. But I would like to start by sharing a few of the benefits of IDP that interns and architects from other states have shared with me. Some of the benefits are obvious, like

providing a structure to apprentice new architects into the profession. Others benefits are less apparent, but equally important in the evolution of the profession. By keeping an eye on the destination and applying the lessons we have learned, we can reframe the journey through IDP from being a time-consuming, burdensome process into a more creative one.

Intern Benefits

The narrow focus of IDP is on creating a well-rounded, skilled architect capable of functioning independently and with a high degree of professional competence. While no one believes that IDP provides a perfect structure for achieving that goal, we designed the current program to give emerging architects a framework and the tools necessary to achieve that goal. The key to success is a proactive attitude. Interns who take control of the process, use the tools provided, and seek out the

resources available gain a broad base of practical knowledge and benefits that may include:

- Reciprocity and freedom to move freely to practice in different states.
- Practical, real-world understanding of the scope of practice.
- A finite, defined program that provides control over pacing and eliminates any of the hit-or-miss that can occur with an unstructured internship.
- Hands-on experience in all areas of practice.
- A tailored IDP experience that fits personal interests and desires.
- Personal connection to mentors who provide a view to the bigger picture.
- The luxury of being an architectural intern and continuing to build on the educational foundation provided in school.

Firm Benefits

The larger focus of IDP is on increasing proficiency across the profession, leading to a higher general skill level and deeper understanding of



President's Message

By Gordon Carrier, President
California Architects Board

California's licensing requirements

have often been a subject of discussion within the profession. In our mission of protecting the public health, safety and welfare, we must strike a balance between shielding consumers from incompetence and

avoiding unreasonable barriers to licensure. The California Architects Board is also well known for conducting thorough analyses and engaging in thoughtful dialogue prior to establishing new requirements. Our return to a key part of the history of the profession—apprenticeship—is guided by that legacy.

Forty-eight other jurisdictions have determined that apprenticeship via the Intern Development Program (IDP) will enrich the experience of their candidates. In California, there has been a growing concern that candidates are lacking in a number of important areas. While there could be several different causes of this deficiency, one obvious component is the breadth of experience they gain prior to licensure. IDP helps assure that candidates have an opportunity to gain experience in core competencies in preparation for licensed practice. Last year, after significant research and discussion, the Board voted to develop regulations and initiate an action plan to implement mandatory IDP with a January 2005* effective date.

In studying IDP, however, the Board questioned whether the quantitative (seat-time) nature of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards' (NCARB) model of IDP is the best means of ascertaining the value or scope of an intern's experience. Accordingly, the Board appointed the Competency-Based IDP Task Force to analyze options for a competency component that would supplement the existing NCARB IDP. The Task Force's goal is not to change IDP, but to enhance it.

Initial meetings of the Task Force, working in conjunction with a professional research firm, have focused on background material from other competency-based programs, definitions of competency, and possible models for determining competence. NCARB is supportive of our efforts and it is possible that if we develop a program it could be implemented on a national basis.

On a simultaneous track, our new IDP Implementation Task Force is refining the draft regulations necessary to implement mandatory IDP by January 2005.* It is also developing an appropriate implementation and communications plan. The communications plan is especially important given the level of coordination that will be needed between the Board and interns, schools, firms, The American Institute of Architects, and NCARB. (For more information about the task forces see page 3.)

As this summary suggests, making IDP a reality in California is a daunting challenge, but one for which the Board is prepared. California's consumers deserve the best from our architects. We hope you share our enthusiasm for reinvigorating apprenticeship and enhancing the profession. ■

**Implementation of mandatory IDP subject to approval of regulatory changes.*

Our Appreciation for Service

Each of the Board's task forces is made up of volunteers who have expressed an interest in and who are willing to give their time to furthering the profession. We want to express sincere gratitude to each of the volunteers for their help and commitment. We also welcome interest in serving on future task forces by contacting the Board at (916) 445-3394 or by e-mail at cab@dca.ca.gov.

IDP Implementation Task Force

Ed Oremen, Chair, Architect Board Member, La Mesa
Allan Cooper, Architect, Educator, San Luis Obispo
Mackey Deasy, Architect, Long Beach
Betsey Olenick Dougherty, Architect, Costa Mesa
Cynthia Easton, Architect, Sacramento
Ed Mojica, Architect, Roseville
Lynn Morris, Deputy Director of Board Relations, Department of Consumer Affairs, Sacramento
Cynthia Choy Ong, Public Board Member, Sausalito
Ron Ronconi, Architect, Mountain View
Paul Welch, AIACC Executive Vice President, Sacramento
Douglas Whiteaker, Intern, Stockton
R.K. Stewart (Ex-Officio Member), Architect, San Francisco

Competency-Based IDP Task Force

R.K. Stewart, Chair, Architect, San Francisco
Donald Crosby, Architect, Emeryville
Betsey Olenick Dougherty, Architect, Costa Mesa
Christine Lampert, Architect Board Member, San Clemente
L. Kirk Miller, Architect Board Member, San Francisco
Linda Sanders, Educator, Pomona
Letrice Sherrillo, Intern, Santa Ana Heights
Paul Welch, AIACC Executive Vice President, Sacramento

Post-Licensure Competency Task Force

L. Kirk Miller, Chair, Architect Board Member, San Francisco
Paul Neel, Vice-Chair, Architect, San Luis Obispo
Gordon Carrier, Architect Board Member, San Diego
Robert De Pietro, Engineer, Los Angeles
Merlyn Isaak, Engineer, Los Gatos
Mike Martin, Architect, Educator, Berkeley
Marc Sandstrom, Public Board Member, Carlsbad
Michael Stepper, Architect, Educator, San Diego
R.K. Stewart, Architect, San Francisco
Dick Zweifel, Landscape Architect, Educator, San Luis Obispo

CAB Task Forces Serving Critical Needs



At the present time, there are three task forces working on the issues facing California architects in the near future.

IDP Implementation Task Force

Bringing the Intern Development Program (IDP) to reality by 2005* will take a concentrated effort. To facilitate the move forward, the Board appointed the IDP Implementation Task Force, chaired by Ed Oremen, to coordinate all aspects of implementation of IDP — including the necessary regulatory changes, and implementation and communication plans. The Task Force met in early September to discuss implementation ideas, issues, and concerns. During that meeting, the Task Force developed a draft communications plan and identified implementation issues that will be reviewed at the Task Force's next meeting to be held in late October.

**Implementation of mandatory IDP subject to approval of regulatory changes.*

Competency-Based IDP Task Force

As it currently exists, IDP consists of documentation of work experience in 16 training areas. When the Board's Professional Qualifications Committee was

studying the possibility of adopting the IDP requirement, they expressed concern over the seat-time nature of the program — documentation is strictly the number of hours obtained in each of the training areas. To address this concern, the Board appointed the Competency-Based IDP Task Force, chaired by R.K. Stewart, to oversee a research project on the possibility of incorporating a competency component into the existing IDP. Professional Management and Evaluation Services, Inc. (PMES) was hired to assist the Board in the research project. At a meeting in early August, PMES discussed their preliminary research and presented a wide range of alternatives that could address the competency issue. The Task Force has identified options that might be viable and is working to develop a formal recommendation to present to our Professional Qualifications Committee.

Task Force on Post-Licensure Competency

The Task Force on Post-Licensure Competency oversaw the development of the California

Architect Proficiency Survey that was mailed in the fall of 2000 to 5,625 individuals, presenting six stakeholder groups — architects, allied design professionals (e.g., engineers, landscape architects), contractors, regulators (building and planning departments), clients/end users, and forensic/insurance/legal professionals.

In a June 2001 meeting, the Task Force reviewed the survey results report and made the following recommendation, which the Board subsequently approved.

“Accept the report on the results of the California Architect Proficiency Survey as prepared by PMES and agree with the conclusions and recommendations contained therein that, on an overall basis, there is not a significant proficiency problem that would warrant mandatory continuing education at this time.”

An executive summary of the report is expected to be approved at the December 2001 Board meeting and should be available for dissemination by the beginning of next year. If you wish to receive a copy of the executive summary, please contact the Board at (916) 445-3394 or by e-mail at cab@dca.ca.gov. ■

Responses to Body of Knowledge

In the last issue, we asked for your opinions in response to the issue of architectural education. Due to space constraints, we cannot print the entirety of every letter received. Here are excerpts from some of the letters received:

EXCERPT FROM MARK ESSERT, AIA

“What is the body of knowledge?”

I think the body of knowledge is comprised of at least the following areas: history; technology; codes and ordinances (health, safety and welfare); energy and environmental sustainability; design as a solution to program schedule and budget; and design as expression (aesthetics)...

...I think schools need to concentrate on design, technology, and environmental issues. I think aesthetics, codes, and business practices are best passed on in the field by established architects (which is meant to include trade organizations such as AIA)."

EXCERPT FROM ELMER E. BOTSAL, ARCH. D., FAIA

“1] Architects never get sued for lousy appearance. They usually get in trouble for a building deficiency. Frankly, I have begun to question ever having a design portion in the exam. Clearly office practices should emphasize proper CD's.

2] Along that line, it has become more common to see schools of architecture placing greater emphasis in “Graphics Designs” and less on basic technology.

3] While I strongly believe (was terrible at it) in History in Architecture, I also now must question it's relevance in the licensing of architects.

4] I believe CAB should try to find what is the leading cause of building failures and legal action. At one time it was “water infiltration”, that may have changed. In any event, try to determine the top areas of problems. That should give you a legitimate target for internship. I can only tell you very few if any offices I am aware of make that a key element in their interns' growth.

5] Finally I believe if CAB did attempt to move in this direction we would find a significantly more solidly based new architect from what we now see. By the way, I presently “do” care about design. Unfortunately my extensive building diagnostics has jaded my opinion.”



EXCERPT FROM BRAD A. BECKHAM

“How did we ever get along without a central place for this ‘Body of Knowledge?’ It’s out there in book, lecture format, periodicals, experience, codes, internet, videos, and our environment. The consolidation of information and maintaining it will take a lot of money and effort. Is this really a priority of the profession? NOT MINE....”

EXCERPT FROM JAMES ROBERT MOORE, ARCHITECT

“... The CAB should not be expanding into education and furthering the goals of NCARB. It should stay focused on the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the people of California.

...Mr. Miller asks, “What constitutes a solid educational experience.” There is no way to define a curriculum or method to “create” an architect. I think they should all learn as I did. It’s the best way in my opinion.... You, CAB, should be focusing on licensing and regulation as required to protect the public from dumb architects and the smart ones too.”

continued page » 5



Knowledge *continued*

EXCERPT FROM KERWIN LEE, AIA ROLF JENSEN & ASSOCIATES, INC. (RJA)

"I am an architect, but specialize in providing consulting services to other architects in the area of building regulations (codes and guidelines). I have been doing this for over 10 years and have found a varying degree of competency from architects on building regulations. The building codes are the one document that has the greatest effect on the design process, yet few (very few) students of architecture really have any idea of what building codes are. I have always felt that any architect with the knowledge of the building codes does a better design and knows how to use the codes to their advantage.

...I don't know of any major school of architecture that has a course in building regulations....

...This is a serious deficiency in the profession and education of architects. If this was made mandatory as part of the education and more so a part of the licensing process, it would improve the level of service architects provide."

EXCERPT FROM ADRIAN ARCHITECTS

"It has been my feeling that graduate architectural students should be required to serve a longer internship. Three years is a minimum when the experience level is very complete ... exposing a young intern to all the many areas of architecture." ■



IDP *continued*

architectural practice. That allows us to better achieve our charter to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Each firm sees those results on a local level along with other benefits that include:

- A structure for training new architects.
- Loyalty and better staff retention.
- Easier recruitment of talented new architects.
- A strong learning culture that extends throughout the firm.
- An environment that encourages reflective practice.
- Reduction of errors and omissions.
- Improved firm visibility through intern community service.

To firms already committed to professional development of younger staff, IDP presents very little challenge. Many California firms have already successfully integrated IDP into their practice. Two firms: Easton Design, in Sacramento, and Caldwell Architects, in Marina del Rey, have already won The American Institute of Architects' (AIA) IDP Outstanding Firm Award for their innovative IDP programs.

Firm Responsibilities

Beyond verification, the most important charge to the firm is to ensure that interns have the opportunity to gain diverse

experience and to help locate opportunities for that experience when they do not exist within the firm. For example, a firm may not be involved in any construction projects. In that case, firms can exchange interns or provide simulated training modules. In Chicago, several firms created a bidding and contract negotiation simulation where interns assumed the role of lead architect through the bidding process. The exercise may have taught the interns more than if they had played a more limited role in a real-world bid. But the most interesting outcome was that the architects leading the exercise felt they learned a great deal by making sure they were imparting accurate information.

Common Concerns

Every time a state implements IDP, firms raise similar concerns about the program's perceived rigidity and the amount of time and administrative work required. We have found time and again that many of these concerns are based on misconceptions. IDP as it exists may not be perfect, but if it were that difficult to administer or seriously flawed, it would have crumbled long ago.

The success of IDP lies on the shoulders of the intern. The framework provides great latitude to explore specific areas of interest while ensuring coverage of the fundamental spectrum. By working with mentors, interns can gain from a senior architect's vision and experience to move beyond those fundamentals.

continued page » 7



ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

CAB is responsible for receiving and investigating complaints against licensees and unlicensed persons. CAB also retains the authority to make final decisions on all enforcement actions taken against its licensees.

Included below is a brief description of recent enforcement actions taken by CAB against individuals who were found to be in violation of the Architects Practice Act.

Every effort is made to ensure that the following information is correct. Before making any decision based upon this information, you should contact CAB. Further information on specific violations may also be obtained by contacting the Board's Enforcement Unit at (916) 445-3394.

Citations

LON W. BIKE (Murrieta) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,500 civil penalty to Lon W. Bike, architect license number C-8334, for violation of Business and Professions Code sections 5536(a) and (b) (Practice Without a License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and California Code of Regulations section 104 (Filing of Addresses). Mr. Bike's license expired on September 30, 1997 and was not renewed until August 19, 1999. This action was taken based on evidence that while Mr. Bike's license was expired he: 1) unlawfully prepared plans for five non-exempt projects; and 2) affixed his stamp, which included the words "LICENSED ARCHITECT," to a site plan. In addition, Mr. Bike failed to notify the Board of a change of address. Mr. Bike paid the civil penalty, satisfying the citation. The citation became effective October 1, 2001.

PAUL CURTIS BUNTON (Fremont) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,500 civil penalty to Paul Bunton, architect license number C-18659, for violations of Business and Professions Code sections 5536.22(a)(3)(4) and (5) (Written Contract) and 5584 (Negligence or Misconduct). This action was taken based on evidence that Mr. Bunton: 1) failed to comply with three of the five statutory requirements for written contracts as provided in Business and Professions Code section 5536.22(a);

2) failed to meet the duty of professional care to mitigate impact of grade differentials in the design of a site and a building addition for a preschool facility; and 3) failed to meet the duty of professional care in the design of accessible doorways for wheelchair access. Mr. Bunton appealed the citation and an administrative hearing was held. The administrative law judge affirmed the citation and on September 26, 2001, Mr. Bunton paid the civil penalty, satisfying the citation.

STANLEY KASSOVIC (Oakland) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Stanley Kassovic, architect license number C-5466, for a violation of Business and Professions Code section 5584 (Willful Misconduct). This action was based on evidence that Mr. Kassovic failed to complete drawings for a new residence and failed to perform the services for which he contracted and had been paid. Mr. Kassovic abandoned the client and caused him monetary damage. The citation became effective August 20, 2001.

MICHAEL R. LEE (Manhattan Beach) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Michael R. Lee, architect license number C-26726, for violations of Business and Professions Code

section 5536(a) (Practice Without a License or Holding Self Out as Architect). This action was based on evidence that on August 31, 2000 and September 28, 2000, while Mr. Lee's architect license was expired, he signed Employment Verification Forms indicating that he was licensed as an "Architect" in California with a license number "C 26726" and an expiration date of "5-31-01." The citation became effective September 27, 2001.

REX E. RAMSEY (Stockton) The Board issued an administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Rex E. Ramsey, architect license number C-17165, for a violation of Business and Professions Code sections 5536(a) and (b) (Practice Without a License or Holding Self Out as Architect). Mr. Ramsey's license expired November 30, 1997 and was not renewed until March 16, 1999. This action was based on evidence that while Mr. Ramsey's license was expired, he unlawfully affixed a stamp to plans with his name, a false renewal date, and the term "Licensed Architect" and used a title block which used the term "Architectural." The citation became effective August 28, 2001.

EDWARD C. SIT (Orinda) The Board issued an administrative citation to Edward C. Sit, architect license number C-14159, for a violation of Business and Professions Code sections 5536.22 (Written Contract) and 5536.1(b) (Stamp Requirements). This action was taken based on evidence that Mr. Sit commenced preparing a set of schematics for a new duplex without having an executed written contract for professional services or an appropriate notice to proceed. The draft contract failed to provide three of the five statutorily required elements. Mr. Sit stamped drawings using a statutorily non-compliant stamp. The citation became effective August 30, 2001. ■



It is the intern who must track his or her progress through the program. The advent of the Internet has made that easier than ever by providing access to a downloadable spreadsheet at www.ncarb.org that allows interns to track hours each day and generate a printed training record for verification by firm personnel.

Good Timing

While the 2005 adoption date* for IDP in California will undoubtedly make waves, the state has a

California is doing. The task force then recruited an architect from each chapter to organize implementation plans for their local chapters, taking into account the make-up of the chapter but carrying an agreed-upon, uniform message. Texas also made certain that every school had IDP presentations by knowledgeable program representatives. Through the chapter representative, the task force was able to communicate the purpose, benefits, and technical information in a consistent fashion. The local presence gave architects and

received along with the answers. The site, which still exists, also features IDP guidelines and additional information, links for interns to locate mentors, mentor guidelines, and other resources.

Ready, Set, Go

As a graduate of University of California, Berkeley, I take a personal interest in helping where and how I can. I will be in California frequently over the next four years giving presentations and helping state coordinating bodies and AIA chapters carry out their implementation strategies.

By working with mentors, interns can gain from a senior architect's vision and experience to move beyond those fundamentals.

tremendous advantage in being one of the last to implement IDP. The 48 states that have gone before have ironed out many of the wrinkles and established a proven path to implementation.

Texas, also a large, culturally and geographically diverse state, used a very effective communications strategy that California might consider emulating. Texas implemented IDP in the early 1980s, before the Internet eased communication and access to information. In that state, AIA and the registration board formed an implementation task force, as

interns a single point of contact to go to for answers. With this model, the task force was able to make presentations to key firms and those expressing the greatest concern.

Illinois, whose IDP program was implemented in 1996, took advantage of the Internet to get information widely disseminated. Frank Heitzman, state coordinator for IDP in Illinois, created a Web site (www.idp-il.com) dedicated exclusively to all IDP-related matters, including a frequently asked question section that allowed him to record the questions he

The time between now and January 2005* will go by faster than most of us care to admit. California has been very active in crafting a strategy to move to that date with ease. California enjoys the benefit of other states' experience and the Internet as a tool. With concentrated effort and a spirit of cooperation, I anticipate that increased understanding will gradually dissipate any concerns. ■

**Implementation of mandatory IDP subject to approval of regulatory changes.*



California Architects Board
400 R Street, Suite 4000
Sacramento, CA 95814-6238

Board Members

Gordon Carrier, Architect Member
Raymond Cheng, Architect Member
Christine Lampert, Architect Member
L. Kirk Miller, Architect Member

Cynthia Choy Ong, Public Member
Edward L. Oremen, Architect Member
Marc Sandstrom, Public Member
Martha Welborne, Public Member

Doug McCauley, Executive Officer

PRSRT STD

U.S. Postage

PAID

Permit No. 685

Sacramento, CA

Inside This Issue

FALL 2001

- Implementing IDP 1
- Board President's Message 2
- Appreciation for Service 2
- CAB Task Forces 3
- Body of Knowledge 4
- Enforcement Actions 6

A L E R T

Unusual Requests for Plans

The California Architects Board received an e-mail from The American Institute of Architects (AIA), the National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE), and the General Services Administration (GSA) regarding unusual requests for plans. Due to recent events in New York and Washington, architects need to be aware of how to respond to unusual requests. The e-mail provides some valuable guidance; its contents are reprinted below.

Dear Design Professional:

A number of firms from the design and engineering community have contacted us to report recent or past requests for building plans that, in light of the attacks of September 11, 2001, appear unusual due to the structures identified in the requests or the type of information solicited. While most requests are likely to be routine and legitimate as in the past, it is appropriate to exercise reasonable caution and good judgement in reviewing each request before providing documents or plans.

The AIA and the NSPE, in conjunction with the GSA, are coordinating with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to provide design firms with information on this situation. The FBI is advising us to heighten our awareness and suggests that design professionals immediately report any suspicious request to the appropriate local FBI field office

and to the National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC) at FBI headquarters. Contact information for FBI field offices is available at www.fbi.gov/contact/fo/fo.htm and in local phone directories. NIPC can be reached by fax (202) 323-2079 or e-mail (nipc.watch@fbi.gov).

*Click on www.aia.org/letter/buildingplanform.pdf to access a form that is available to assist you and your colleagues in tracking and reporting unusual requests. **Again, please note that all reports should be sent directly to your local FBI field office and to the NIPC.** If the report involves a GSA building or project, a copy of the report should be sent to the Criminal Investigation Division of the Federal Protection Service as detailed on the report form.*

Thank you for your attention and for any assistance you can provide in circulating this letter and form to other design professionals. ■

TO GET IN TOUCH WITH US

California Architects Board 400 "R" Street, Suite 4000 » Sacramento, CA 95814-6238 » (916) 445-3393 » Fax: (916) 445-8524
Email: cab@dca.ca.gov » www.cab.ca.gov